

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-18 are currently pending and amended.

The changes to the claims address minor informalities and cosmetic matters of form.

Thus, the changes to the claims add no new matter.

The outstanding Official Action rejected Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy of an interview between the Examiner and Applicants representative on November 3, 2011. During the interview, Applicants' representative discussed the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants' representative explained that the recited packet communication system includes a plurality of edge-packet transfer units, each of which includes an external packet transmitting/receiving unit, an internal packet transmitting/receiving unit, a packet recognizing unit. Applicants' representative further explained that Claim 1 and the corresponding dependent claims further recited features of each of the units included in each of the edge-packet transfer units. In view of this discussion, the Examiner suggested reciting a specific edge-packet transfer unit from the plurality of edge-packet transfer units in association with each of the units included in the specific edge-packet transfer units to overcome the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicants' representative subsequently proposed reciting a "first specific edge-packet transfer unit from the plurality of edge-packet transfer units" in association with each of the units included in the "first specific edge-packet transfer unit." The Examiner looked favorably to these proposed claim amendments, but indicated that further consideration may

be necessary upon filing a response to the outstanding Official Action. Amendments and arguments discussed during the interview are incorporated herein and reiterated below.

Applicants traverse the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph in part.

Applicants submit that the changes to Claims 1-18 provide antecedent basis for the recitation of “the packet,” “the external packet transmitting/receiving unit,” “the internal-packet transmitting/receiving unit,” “the packet recognizing unit,” and “the edge-packet transfer unit.” Further, Applicants submit that the recitation of “the wavelength path” on page 3, line 24 of Claim 1 has proper antecedent basis based on the recitation of “a wavelength path” in Claim 1 on page 2, line 5.

Thus, Applicants submit that the changes to the claims address the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1 and 9, and claims depending therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendments and above remarks, no further issues are believed to be outstanding. The present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/09)



Soumya Panda
Registration No. 60,447